

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	r		1		
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/749,867	12/31/2003	Yan Zhou	75622P006201	6324	
22503 DAVIS & ASS	7590 06/01/2007 OCIATES		EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 1093	•		SINGH, RAMNANDAN P		
DRIPPING SP.	RINGS, TX 78620		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2614		
			· .		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/01/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

			Application	No	Applicant(s)	 			
		ר	Application		Applicant(s)				
		10/749,867		ZHOU, YAN					
	Office Action S	Summary	Examiner		Art Unit				
			Ramnandar	- I	2614				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply									
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any	CHEVER IS LONGER, nsions of time may be available SIX (6) MONTHS from the mai operiod for reply is specified abore to reply within the set or extended.	PRY PERIOD FOR REPLY FROM THE MAILING DA under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 (ling date of this communication. ove, the maximum statutory period wended period for reply will, by statute, or than three months after the mailing a 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS 36(a). In no even will apply and will on the applic to cause the applic	S COMMUNICATION t, however, may a reply be time expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ation to become ABANDONEI	N. tely filed the mailing date of this commut (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status									
1)🛛	Responsive to comm	unication(s) filed on <u>02 M</u>	larch 2007.		-				
. —	This action is FINAL.	, —	action is no						
3)		is in condition for allowar				rits is			
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	ion of Claims								
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	4a) Of the above clair Claim(s) is/are Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are Claim(s) is/are	ejected.	wn from cons						
Applicati	ion Papers								
10)	The drawing(s) filed of Applicant may not required Replacement drawing s	ojected to by the Examine n is/are: a) ☐ according a set that any objection to the sheet(s) including the correct on is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) drawing(s) be tion is required	held in abeyance. Seed if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1				
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119)							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 									
2) Notice 3) Infor	ce of References Cited (PT	Drawing Review (PTO-948)	:	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other: <i>Rejection</i> .	ate				

Application/Control Number: 10/749,867

Art Unit: 2614

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-25 of copending Application No. 10/749,875. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 1 of the instant application recites "A subscriber line interface circuit

Application/Control Number: 10/749,867 Page 3

Art Unit: 2614

apparatus, comprising: a driver combining a downstream voice signal in a voiceband range and a downstream data signal in a non-voiceband range into a common downstream signal for a subscriber line; and receiver circuitry coupled to provide an upstream data signal and an upstream voice signal from an upstream signal carried by the subscriber line, wherein the driver and receiver circuitry reside on a same integrated circuit die".

Comparing claim 1 of the instant application with claim 1 of the co-pending application it is clear that claim 1 of the instant application is a broader version of claim 1 of the co-pending application. As such, both the instant application and the co-pending application are claiming a common subject matter.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 1-20 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under Double Patenting, set forth in this Office action.

Application/Control Number: 10/749,867

Art Unit: 2614

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on Mar 02, 2007 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramnandan Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7529. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH (8:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2614

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ramnandan Singh Examiner Art Unit 2614